Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are now in the application. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 have been amended. Claim 11 was previously cancelled. Claims 15 and 16 have been added. Support for claim 15 can be found on page 17, lines 1-3 of the specification. Support for claim 16 can be found in Figs. 2 and 4 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 14 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Vrotacoe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,674) (hereinafter "Vrotacoe") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in Figs. 2, 3, and 4.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 call for, inter alia:

an internal pipe having a longitudinal axis disposed coaxially with the axis of the exposure drum and at least one rotary lead-through fluidically communicating with the internal pipe for feeding a temperature-controlled liquid into the internal pipe, thereby achieving a defined temperature of the printing plate.

It is once again noted that the corporate assignee of the Vrotacoe reference is also an assignee of the instant application. Therefore, applicant is very familiar with the Vrotacoe reference.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's allegations on page 2 of the Office action that Vrotacoe discloses an internal pipe (22) disposed on an axis of the exposure drum through which a temperature-controlled liquid flows.

The Vrotacoe reference discloses that the cylinder body (1) has a compartment (10) that is filled with a fluid (33). A gas tube (22) extends through the cylinder body (1). The gas

tube (22) is used for expanding a tubular sleeve with pressurized gas (column 4, lines 1-22). Accordingly, Vrotacoe discloses that the tube (22) is used for expanding a tubular sleeve and is not used for achieving a defined temperature of a printing plate that is disposed on the cylinder body (1). This is also supported by column 2, lines 40-51 of Vrotacoe, cited by the Examiner, which disclose that an axially extending gas passage being connected to grooves for blowing off the tubular sleeve. The air passage passes at least one compartment within the printing unit cylinder being filled with a fluid. Vrotacoe discloses that the compartment within the printing unit cylinder is filled with a fluid. Accordingly, the gas passage (22) of Vrotacoe does not have a temperature-controlled fluid for achieving a defined temperature of a printing plate that is disposed on the cylinder body. Therefore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's remarks that Vrotacoe discloses an internal pipe (22) disposed on an axis of the exposure drum through which a temperature-controlled liquid flows, are not correct.

Vrotacoe discloses an internal spiral jacket (110) disposed in a compartment (43) for circulating a fluid as shown in Figs. 4(b) and 4(c). When the spiral jacket (110) is used the gas passages (41 and 42) are disposed in the circumference of the cylinder body (40). The spiral jacket is not an internal pipe

having a longitudinal axis disposed coaxially with the axis of an exposure drum.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show an internal pipe having a longitudinal axis disposed coaxially with the axis of the exposure drum and at least one rotary lead-through fluidically communicating with the internal pipe for feeding a temperature-controlled liquid into the internal pipe, thereby achieving a defined temperature of the printing plate, as recited in claims 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the instant application. The Vrotacoe reference discloses an axially extending gas tube disposed in a cylinder or a spiral jacket disposed in the cylinder. Vrotacoe does not disclose an internal pipe that having a longitudinal axis disposed coaxially with the axis of the exposure drum for receiving a temperature-controlled liquid. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which an internal pipe has a longitudinal axis disposed coaxially with the axis of the exposure drum and at least one rotary leadthrough fluidically communicates with the internal pipe for feeding a temperature-controlled liquid into the internal pipe, thereby achieving a defined temperature of the printing plate.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2 and 5-8 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claims 3, 4, and 9 have been rejected as being obvious over Vrotacoe (U.S. Patent No.5,535,674) in view of Feller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,402) (hereinafter "Feller") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Feller does not make up for the deficiencies of Vrotacoe. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 3, 4, and 9 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim 10 has been rejected as being obvious over Vrotacoe (U.S. Patent No.5,535,674) in view of Feller (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,402) and further in view of Marmin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,967,036) (hereinafter "Marmin") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Marmin does not make up for the deficiencies of Vrotacoe and Feller. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 10 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the first full paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claims 12 and 13 have been rejected as being obvious over Vrotacoe (U.S. Patent No.5,535,674) in view of Hosokawa. is noted that the Examiner has not given a Publication number

for the Hosokawa reference in the rejection or on a form PTO-Therefore, it is not known what reference the Examiner 892. is using in the rejection. Accordingly, applicant cannot comment with respect to this rejection. The Examiner is kindly requested to clarify this rejection in any further Office action. It is however noted, as indicated above, that claims 12 and 13 are believed to be allowable over Vrotacoe.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 12, 13, or 14. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-16 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler 52,794

AKD:cgm

January 9, 2006

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A. Post Office Box 2480 Hollywood, FL 33022-2480 Tel: (954) 925-1100 Fax: (954) 925-1101